

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 10/29/2004

| APPLICATION NO. | FI | LING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO |
|---|----------------------|------------|----------------------|---------------------|-----------------|
| 10/605,221 | 0/605,221 09/16/2003 | | Beverly Jean Oke | A3-1656 | 2220 |
| 27127 | 7590 | 10/29/2004 | | EXAMINER | |
| HARTMAN & HARTMAN, P.C. 552 EAST 700 NORTH VALPARAISO, IN 46383 | | | • | PHILLIPS, CHARLES E | |
| | | | | ART UNIT . | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | | 3751 | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| | Office Action Commence | 10/605,221 | OKE, BEVERLY JEAN | | | | |
| | Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | | Charles E. Phillips | 3751 | | | | |
| Period fo | The MAILING DATE of this communication apports reply | ears on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence address | | | | |
| THE - Exte - after - If the - If NC - Failt Any | ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. e period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days fill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE | nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133). | | | | |
| Status | | | , | | | | |
| 1) | Responsive to communication(s) filed on | _• . | | | | | |
| 2a)□ | This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This | action is non-final. | | | | | |
| 3) | 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is | | | | | | |
| | closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | | |
| Disposit | ion of Claims | • | | | | | |
| 4) 🖂 | 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-11</u> is/are pending in the application. | | | | | | |
| | 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. | | | | | | |
| 5) | Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1-11</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. | | | | | | |
| 6) | | | | | | | |
| 7) | | | | | | | |
| 8) | Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or | election requirement. | | | | | |
| Applicati | ion Papers | • | | | | | |
| 9) | The specification is objected to by the Examiner | · . | | | | | |
| 10) | The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce | epted or b) \square objected to by the E | Examiner. | | | | |
| | Applicant may not request that any objection to the o | drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See | 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | | |
| | Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction | on is required if the drawing(s) is obj | ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). | | | | |
| 11)[_] | The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa | aminer. Note the attached Office | Action or form PTO-152. | | | | |
| Priority (| ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | | |
| 12) | Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign | priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a) | -(d) or (f). | | | | |
| a) All b) Some * c) None of: | | | | | | | |
| 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. | | | | | | | |
| | 2. Certified copies of the priority documents | have been received in Application | on No | | | | |
| | 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori | | d in this National Stage | | | | |
| | application from the International Bureau | • | | | | | |
| * 5 | See the attached detailed Office action for a list of | of the certified copies not receive | d. | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Attachmen | t(s) | 100 | | | | | |
| | e of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) Interview Summary | , | | | | |
| | e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa | atent Application (PTO-152) | | | | |
| • | r No(s)/Mail Date | 6) Other: | | | | | |

Application/Control Number: 10/605,221

Art Unit: 3751

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The instant disclosure fails to provide support for a means or manner for the "removal" of one or more of the supports to "enable access to the enclosed space beneath the cover."

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boyle et al in view of Burton.

Boyle et al teach a pool cover frame constructed of plastic tube section to form a domed structure which by its nature depicted in Figs 3-3B is readily removable.

Lacking in Boyle et al is the "first circular portion being a lowermost base of the frame", this feature is taught by Burton at 12.

Art Unit: 3751

It would have been obvious to provide the former with such a feature in lieu of the Fig. 9 scheme of attachments, in that both teach identical art devices and the use of the base of one cover would have been prima facie obvious for use in lieu of the other.

The ratio is deemed met by the scales depicted in the drawing here. In any event such ration would have constituted obvious expedients of design depending merely on the pool clearance desired.

The claim 7 straps are taught at 37 of Burton.

Bellas et al shoe another pool cover.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Charles Philips at telephone number 308-1515.

Charles E. Phillips
Primary Examiner